

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 and 12-22 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 22 are amended, and claims 2-11 are canceled. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 22 is objected to as conjunctively referring to previous claims. By this Amendment, claim 22 has been amended simply to specify that the outer tapered surface is constituted by an exposed surface of the copper coating layer.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim objection are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed, especially as claim 1 now makes clear that t is a wall thickness of the bush bearing at the cylindrical surface of the bush bearing, which is not an “optional” feature.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6, 12-15 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Hiuga (JP 59-212508). This rejection is respectfully traversed at least because amended claim 1 includes the subject matter of claims 4, 5 and 7-11, which subject matter was not rejected based on Hiuga.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Similarly, the rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 11-15, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hiuga is respectfully traversed because claim 1 now includes the subject matter of claims 4, 5 and 7-10 which was not rejected in paragraph 7 of the Office Action.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hiuga in view of Heshmat (U.S. Patent No. 4,277,113). This rejection is respectfully traversed at least because claim 1 now

includes the subject matter of claims 7-11, which was not rejected based on the combination of Hiuga in view Heshmat.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 7-10 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hiuga in view of Sakamaki (U.S. Patent No. 4,561,835). This rejection is respectfully traversed at least because claim 1 includes the subject matter of claims 4, 5 and 11, which subject matter was not rejected based on the combination of Hiuga in view of Sakamaki.

Moreover, Hiuga, Heshmat and Sakamaki do not teach or suggest a bush bearing that includes a cylindrical surface, a tapered surface, and one annular end face which are constituted by an exposed surface of the copper coating, the outer peripheral edge of the annular end face having a small diameter compared to a diameter of a hole of an aluminum-made housing in which the bush bearing is press fitted. Thus, the structure set forth in claim 1 is capable of providing a bush bearing which makes it possible to eliminate the occurrence of dust (e.g., metal powder dust, particularly aluminum chips) at the time of press fitting into the housing hole. This makes it possible to easily perform the press fitting without crushing the open end and the like of the hole to be press fitted into, and which makes it possible to ensure the roundness of the inner peripheral surface even after press fitting. Hiuga discloses drive bearings and a method for producing them, while Heshmat discloses compliant fluid film bearings. Sakamaki discloses a rotary compressor. None of these references teach that the bush bearing in which the cylindrical surface, the tapered surface and the one annular end face are constituted by an exposed surface of the copper coating layer, the outer peripheral edge of the annular end face having a small diameter compared to a diameter of a hole of an aluminum-made housing in which the bush bearing is press fitted.

Moreover, the Examiner cites *In re Aller* in regard to a number of the claimed features in the present application, e.g., an angle of intersection  $\theta$  between the tapered surface and an axial line being not less than  $15^\circ$  and not more than  $25^\circ$ . However, *Aller* involved a situation where the general conditions of the claim were disclosed in the prior art. Thus, in order to establish a *prima facie* case for obviousness, the Examiner must first establish that the general conditions of what is claimed is disclosed in the prior art. The Examiner has failed to conduct such analysis, and therefore has failed to establish a *prima facie* case for obviousness. In this case, it is not necessary for Applicants to respond, until such time that the Examiner points to specific sections of the prior art which allegedly show the general conditions of the claimed subject matter.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims are patentable and that the entire application is in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, in the fee(s) filed, or asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Account No. 14-1140 under Order No. PTB-1207-133.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable to place the application in better condition for allowance, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:                     /Paul T. Bowen/                      
Paul T. Bowen  
Reg. No. 38,009

PTB:jck  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100